

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/653,169	09/01/2000	Hiroshi Sakamoto	381AS/49210	5473
7:	590 07/08/2003			
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300			EXAMINER	
			FISCHMANN, BRYAN R	
Washington, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3618	25
			DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Lodemark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

ION NO./ FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / NO. PATENT IN REEXAMINATION			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
			EXAMINER	
		ART UNIT	PAPER	
	FILING DATE		PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

25

Paper 23 dated 5-9-2003 requested a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Along with the request for RCE was submitted a duplicate Information Disclosure Statement (IDS - paper 22 - dated 5-9-2003). An RCE was apparently submitted for consideration of the IDS, since a Notice of Allowability (paper 21 - dated 5/7/2003) had already been "issued" for this Application. Since Paper 22 is a duplicate of previously considered IDS (paper 20 - dated 1-31-2003), the RCE submission is improper, since nothing "new" has been submitted. Thefore, the RCE (paper 23) and the IDS (paper 22) are not considered and are improper and a Notice of improper RCE will be sent in due course. See 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant should formally request a refund for the RCE in writing.

Attachment: Inverview Summary (paper 24)

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/653,169 Applicant(s)

SAKAMOTO, ET AL

Examiner

Bryan Fischmann

Art Unit 3618

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):
(1) Bryan Fischmann (3)
(2) William Ackerman (4)
Date of Interview May 22, 2003
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: None
Identification of prior art discussed: none
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Ackerman requested that the RCE (paper 23) filed 5-9-2003 be "canceled", as the purpose of the RCE was to request consideration, after allowance, of an IDS (paper 22) that was a duplicate of a previously considered IDS (paper 20).
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
i) 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required